

Part B

LEAD AGENCY/BUREAU AND/OR SUBCOMMITTEE/WORKING GROUP

REPORT (Agencies with Lead Responsibilities Assigned under Circular A-16 in Appendix E - <http://www.fgdc.gov/publications/a16final.html#appendix>) (Please provide a separate report for each activity for which you have the lead)

1. Program/Activity Name: **Cadastral Data SC**
2. What are the specific federal programs this data supports? **Cadastral data support virtually all land management programs and decisions from planning to energy and fire to emergency management and habitat restoration and recreation.**
3. Uses of Data: How does your data benefit customers and support agency missions? **Cadastral data represent a record location of decision, ownership, restrictions and authorizations on public lands. Cadastral records in the BLM also record of original patent records and land transactions and their location. The uses of this data are well documented but range from land transaction and use authorizations and leasing for such activities and land use as energy development, timber, mineral extraction, land conveyance, wilderness etc.**
4. Charter/Plan: Do you have a current charter or plan for collection? If so - please describe (include how recently the charter/plan was implemented and whether it is in need of update). **The subcommittee for cadastral data has a charter but does not have a plan for collection. The subcommittee has not authority or the collection of data but does coordinate collection activities and strategies between federal agencies and between levels of government.**
5. Performance Measures: Does your agency have performance measures for your data theme? If so, please list the measures and whether you achieved your goals. **Yes, performance measures are related to the collection and maintenance of cadastral survey data.**
6. Metadata Status: Is metadata discoverable and served through the NSDI Clearinghouse? What percentage of this theme's data has metadata and is in a Clearinghouse node? **The data is served through Geospatial One-Stop – not the Clearinghouse because this would be a duplication of effort. 100% of the cadastral survey data has metadata.**
7. Standards: What is the status of this theme's data, process, transfer, and classification standards? **Ongoing collection and maintenance occurs with every land transaction. Significant delays have been experienced in published this data on the Internet.**
8. Progress: List FY 2004 activities/progress to date (quantify where possible).
 - **completed projects to determine the “core” level of data needed to support specific business applications and identified needed additions to the FGDC Cadastral Data Content Standard (this was a test of the standard)**

- developed draft criteria for evaluating standards compliance and initiated a pilot evaluation of BLM's cadastral data
- replaced the website for the cadastral subcommittee and expanded upon the materials and sources of information that are made available www.nationalcad.org
- completed an inventory local sources of cadastral data nationwide
- completed a workshop based upon hurricanes to identify the level of cadastral data and standards required to support related planning, response and recovery activities
- developed and completed all work specified for the Geospatial One-Stop standard development and publication for comment
- initiated a pilot project for common points of control to assist with vertical integration issues within a theme and between data themes

9. Participation: List participating Federal agencies.

10. Planned Activities: What are your planned activities for FY05?

- **Make final changes to the content standards based upon pilot projects**
- **Complete the evaluation criteria for standards compliance**
- **Develop materials and procedures for determining self compliance**
- **Evaluate data for compliance from example locations**
- **Update the cadastral data inventory for local sources and expand the inventory to include state and federal sources of data.**
- **Complete the Geospatial One-Stop Standard**
- **Complete pilot project on common control**

11. Policy: Do you have a formal agency policy in place for full and open access or data sharing? **Yes** Are you able to fulfill this policy and provide public access with your current agency financial resources as allocated or are you in pursuit of collaborative federal partnerships to support data access? **Yes, however, we have experienced significant delays in posting data to the Internet, sometimes as long as 18 months for updates to be made after they are submitted for posting.**

12. Are there areas or issues regarding lead responsibilities for spatial data themes that require attention, or lessons-learned that you would like to share with others? Please describe.

- **The lack of overall guidance/sideboards such as criteria for standards compliance and/or business drivers for standards and the publication of data have resulted in many inconsistencies and variance in standards and strategies such as the scope and detail described in FGDC as well as Geospatial One-Stop standards. For example, the themes standards for Geospatial One-Stop vary greatly in the level of detail within each standard because each theme used different criteria to determining the scope of what was in the respective standard. This lack of common ground or business need has resulted in a proposed standard and is inconsistent in scope and ultimately its use. This is also true of compliance with**

standards for which we do not have a common definition. Some themes do not have criteria for compliance or the criteria differ from theme to theme and may not be documented. The result is an inability to determine where we are in regard to compliance and implementation of standards within the federal government or any organization.

- The duplication of effort between many framework, clearinghouse/portal efforts needs to be addressed. This duplication has resulted in confusion and wasted time/resources and has frustrated potential participants at the local level. In addition, we have duplicate standards (e.g., FGDC metadata standard and the Geospatial One-Stop Standard which are not the same).
- Definitions for terms and inconsistent use of terminology such as framework and framework data remains and issue that causes confusion.
- The lack of the financial incentives needed to implement standards, especially in cases where data already exists is an issue that has gone unaddressed for a number of years.
- Finally, we are still in the process of developing and redeveloping standards (e.g., new One-Stop framework standards to replace the old FGDC framework standards). We need to focus our efforts, dollars and energy on testing and implementation of the standards we already, have rather than developing more standards. In addition, all standards should be tested and proven before they are finalized and recommended for ANSI status. The development of standards on paper is only the first step and it seems as if the entire FGDC and Geospatial One-Stop efforts have ignored or just not addressed the other steps such as testing, maintenance and implementation.